

REMARKS**Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 20, 24, 25, 29, 30, and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,295,513 to Thackston (hereinafter “Thackston”).

It is well settled that to anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim. *See* MPEP § 2131. Moreover, in order for a reference to be anticipatory under 35 U.S.C. § 102 with respect to a claim, “[t]he elements must be arranged as required by the claim.” *See* MPEP § 2131, citing *In re Bond*, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990). Furthermore, in order for a reference to be anticipatory under 35 U.S.C. § 102 with respect to a claim, “[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the . . . claim.” *See* MPEP § 2131, citing *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 USPQ2d 1913 (Fed. Cir. 1989). Applicant respectfully asserts that the applied reference does not satisfy these requirements.

Applicant has amended claims 20, 25, and 30. The amendments are supported by the specification by, inter alia, page 9, line 24 through page 10, line 22. No new matter has been entered.

Claim 20 recites:

means for automatically logging discrete changes to said CAD elements in respective records according to said input commands, wherein said discrete changes are maintained chronologically; and

means for generating a hypertext markup language (HTML) report from said records to enable user access to information related to changes to said CAD elements in a manner that is independent of client applications.

Claim 25 recites:

automatically logging discrete changes to said CAD elements in respective records according to said input commands, wherein said discrete changes are maintained chronologically; and

generating, by said collaboration server, a hypertext markup language (HTML) report from said records to enable user access to information related to changes to said CAD elements in a manner that is independent of client applications.

Claim 30 recites:

a collaboration server application for receiving input commands from a plurality of remote client applications to modify said CAD elements during a design session, wherein said collaboration server application identifies discrete changes to said CAD elements, creates a log of said discrete changes in a chronological order, and generates a hypertext markup language (HTML) report to enable user access to information related to changes to said CAD elements in a manner that is independent of client applications, wherein said HTML report is provided to each client to enable CAD users to review each change made to CAD elements during said design session while said design session is occurring.

Thackston is directed to a computer system that hosts a collaborative environment for an engineering design and development effort. *See* Abstract. The Examiner asserts that the computer system of Thackston maintains a history of changes to the engineering design by referring to FIGURE 1 of Thackston. *See* Office Action, page 2. In particular, the Examiner identifies the “timeline” depiction in FIGURE 1 that shows the occurrence of multiple designs. However, the specification of Thackston states that FIGURE 1 merely depicts the activities performed over time by the design personnel. *See* col. 1, line 65 through col. 2, line 21. FIGURE 1 of Thackston does not refer to the operation of any computer system or server.

Thackston does disclose so-called “revision history documents” that provide a list or a history of design changes. *See* col. 14, lines 39-41. Thackston does not discuss how such documents are actually generated. Presumably, an engineer must create the revision history documents. However, relying upon engineering personnel to create revision documents is problematic. Specifically, engineering effort is used inefficiently. Also, there is no guarantee such documents accurately reflect the evolution of the engineering design. For example, engineering personnel may simply neglect to create the revision documents. Also, engineering personnel may incorrectly describe changes due to delay between the occurrence of the changes and the recordation of changes in the revision documents.

Therefore, Thackston does not teach logging discrete changes and generating an HTML report in the manner recited by these claims.

Additionally, in regard to claim 30, there is no disclosure in Thackston that an HTML report is provided to CAD users while the users are participating in the collaborative design

process (i.e., while the design session is occurring) to enable the users to review the changes made during the session.

Accordingly, the applied references do not teach each and every limitation of claims 20, 25, and 30. Claims 24, 29, and 34 respectively depend from base claims 20, 25, and 30 and, hence, inherit all limitations of their base claim. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 20, 24, 25, 29, 30, and 34 are not anticipated.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 21, 26, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thackston in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,694,544 to Tanigawa et al. (hereinafter “Tanigawa”).

To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art cited must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. *See* M.P.E.P. § 2143. Applicant asserts that the applied references do not satisfy these criteria.

Claims 21, 26, and 31 respectively depend from base claims 20, 25, and 30 and, hence, inherit all limitations of their respective base claim. As discussed in regard to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), Thackston does not teach or suggest each and every limitation of claims 20, 25, and 30. Tanigawa is merely directed to a system that allows collaborative users to provide comments to each other while making changes to a drawing document. *See* Abstract of Tanigawa. Tanigawa is not relied upon to address the limitations of base claims 20, 25, and 30. Moreover, Tanigawa does not teach or suggest each and every limitation of these claims.

Accordingly, the applied references (either alone or in combination) do not teach or suggest each and every limitation of claims 20, 25, and 30. A prima facie case of obviousness has not been established for claims 21, 26, and 31 due to their dependency from the base claims, in addition to the novel and nonobvious limitations recited therein.

Claims 22, 23, 27, 28, 32, and 33

Applicant notes that claims 22, 23, 27, 28, 32, and 33 are listed as being rejected in the Office Action Summary. However, these claims are not discussed in the body of the Office Action. Because there is no explicit rejection of these claims, Applicant is unable to address the Examiner's position regarding these claims. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to provide the basis for the rejection of these claims in the next office action or allow claims 22, 23, 27, 28, 32, and 33.

Conclusion

In view of the above, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance. Applicant believes that no fee is required. However, if any fee is due, please charge Deposit Account No. 08-2025, under Order No. 20001760-1 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as Express Mail, Label No. EV 482710075US in an envelope addressed to: M/S Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, Alexandria, VA 22313.

Date of Deposit: May 23, 2005

Typed Name: Gail L. Miller

Signature: Gail L. Miller

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Christopher S. L. Crawford

Reg. No. 51,586

Date: May 23, 2005

Telephone No. (214) 855-8378